UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,015	06/22/2006	Soo Keong Koh	019721-9002-00	4762

23409 7590 03/10/2009

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE
Suite 3300
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER	
LU, SHIRLEY	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/584,015	KOH, SOO KEONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHIRLEY LU	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 June 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

112 Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim(s) 7 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation “and/or” is not clear since it is not clear which combination of "and" or "or" is required by the claim. For purposes of this action, the limitation will be interpreted as “or.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gustafson 6050622 in view of Atherton 20020036237.

As to claim(s) 1, 10,

Gustafson discloses:

A tag for use as a taper-evident seal, including: a transponder having a circuit and an antenna connected to the circuit; the transponder being able, when intact, to communicate with an interrogator device (fig. 1; [3, 13-30]; [3, 37-59]),

the tag having a line of weakness extending across at least a portion of the antenna or between the antenna and the integrated circuit chip, such that when the tag is broken along the line of weakness the transponder is rendered unable to communicate with the interrogator device (fig. 4, 11; [4, 47-59]);

a first web of flexible material, having an adhesive coating applied to an outer surface thereof, to enable the tag to be affixed to an article; and a second web of flexible material, wherein the transponder is disposed between the first and second webs of material in a laminar structure (fig. 1, 6-8, 13; [9, 64 et seq.]; [6, 50 et seq]).

and affixing the RFID tag to the package by means of the adhesive coating applied to the first web of flexible material of the tag; such that the line of weakness of the tag is aligned with a line of opening of the package, whereby, when the package is opened along said line of opening, the tag is broken along said line of weakness (fig. 3, 5, 10; [5, 1-13]; [5, 14-37]; [5, 37-57]);

The above art/combination above does not expressly teach an RFID tag, RFID transponder, RFID interrogator, integrated circuit chip.

Gustafson discloses a tag, transponder, interrogator, and circuit; integrated component (fig. 1; [3, 38-58]).

Atherton discloses an RFID tag, RFID transponder, RFID interrogator, integrated circuit chip ([0027]; [0032]; [0066]; [13, 7-12]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above art/combination to teach an RFID tag, RFID transponder, RFID interrogator, integrated circuit chip, so as to detect remotely whether a seal applied to an item has been tampered with or removed, and to enable information about an item to be stored on an item and allow stored information to be modified at a distance, using a compact and cost effective means.

As to claim(s) 2,

Gustafson discloses the transponder includes a support upon which the circuit and antenna are mounted (fig. 1; [3, 14-30]).

Atherton discloses the RFID transponder further includes a supporting substrate upon which the integrated circuit chip and antenna are mounted ([0071]).

As to claim(s) 3, 4, Gustafson discloses:

the first and second webs of flexible material are made of paper or plastic ([3, 14-30]; [6, 58-67]; [7, 1-13]).

As to claim(s) 5, Gustafson discloses:

the line of weakness includes a line of perforations (fig. 11; [8, 19-34]; [5, 38-57]).

As to claim(s) 6, Atherton discloses:

the RFID transponder is a passive RFID transponder ([0027]).

As to claim(s) 7, Gustafson discloses:

the line of weakness is provided in the first and/or second web of flexible material (fig. 4, 11; [4, 47-59]; [4, 3-41]).

As to claim(s) 8, Gustafson discloses:

one or more additional lines of weakness, each of which extends across at least a portion of the antenna or between the antenna and the integrated circuit chip, such that when the seal tag is broken along any one or more of the lines of weakness the RFID transponder is rendered unable to communicate with the RFID interrogator device (fig. 11, 4; [4, 47-59]).

As to claim(s) 9, Gustafson discloses:

the antenna is a coil antenna ([3, 14-30]).

As to claim(s) 11-12, 15-16,

Gustafson discloses:

A method of sealing a package in order to enable the detection of unauthorized access to the contents of the package, including the steps of:

providing a tag, each tag having a transponder having a circuit and an antenna connected to the circuit; the transponder being able, when intact, to communicate with an interrogator device (fig. 1; [3, 13-30]; [3, 37-59]; [6, 16-34]),

the tag having a line of weakness extending across at least a portion of the antenna or between the antenna and the integrated circuit chip, such that when the tag is broken along the line of weakness the transponder is rendered unable to communicate with the interrogator device (fig. 4, 11; [4, 47-59]);

a first web of flexible material, having an adhesive coating applied to an outer surface thereof, to enable the tag to be affixed to an article; and a second web of flexible material, wherein the transponder is disposed between the first and second webs of material in a laminar structure (fig. 1, 6-8, 13; [6, 50 et seq]; [9, 64 et seq.]).

and affixing the RFID tag to the package by means of the adhesive coating applied to the first web of flexible material of the tag, such that the line of weakness of the tag is aligned with a line of opening of the package, whereby, when the package is opened along said line of opening, the tag is broken along said line of weakness (fig. 3, 5, 10; [5, 1-37]; [5, 37-57]);

storing an article within a container; subsequently interrogating the tag using an interrogator device; and detecting unauthorized tampering with, or removal of, the article by a failure of the tag to respond to the interrogator device ([5, 14-29]; [4, 48-59]; fig. 3, 5);

the step of affixing the RFID tag to the article includes affixing the RFID tag to the package such that the line of weakness of the tag is aligned with a line of opening of the package, whereby, when the package is opened along said line of opening, the tag is broken along said line of weakness (fig. 5; [5, 14-37]; [5, 37-57]);

The above art/combination above does not expressly teach an RFID tag, RFID transponder, RFID interrogator, integrated circuit chip; a plurality of RFID tags; article within the container.

Gustafson discloses a tag, transponder, interrogator, and circuit; integrated component (fig. 1; [3, 38-58]); sealing two relatively movable objects, a cardboard or other type of box; the sealing device may be adapted to all sorts of closure; contents within a container, monitoring a suitcase, drawer, box, bottle, and contents [5, 14-37]; [1, 16-32]).

Atherton discloses an RFID tag, RFID transponder, RFID interrogator, integrated circuit chip ([0027]; [0032]; [0066]; [13, 7-12]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above art/combination to teach an RFID tag, RFID transponder, RFID interrogator, integrated circuit chip; a plurality of RFID tags; article within the container, so as to detect remotely whether a seal applied to an item has been tampered with or removed, and to enable information about an item to be stored on an item and allow stored information to be modified at a distance, using a compact and cost effective means; to provide extra security by such things as using multiple boxes, sealing seal both sides of a box, or by using multiple seals along a closure.

As to claim(s) 13, the above art/combination discloses:

providing identifying information stored within the RFID tag prior to storing the article within the container, and wherein the step of interrogating the RFID tag includes reading the identifying information from the RFID tag and the step of detecting unauthorized tampering includes detecting whether the identifying information has changed since the article was stored within the container (Atherton [0066-67]; [0083]; Gustafson [3, 38-58]; [6, 16-34]; [1, 16-32]; claim 12 above).

As to claim(s) 14, the above art/combination discloses:

the identifying information is transmitted electronically from a first location at which the article is stored within the container to a second location at which the RFID tag is

interrogated, and detecting whether the identifying information has changed; electronically transmitted identifying information and identifying information read from the RFID tag (Atherton [0066-67]; [0083]; Gustafson [1, 15-32]; claim 12 above); (Atherton [0066-67]).

The above art/combination above does not expressly teach comparing the identifying information.

Gustafson discloses programming a code on the tag, only responding to an interrogator if it is the same code, and locking the code after it has been programmed [3, 37-58].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above art/combination to teach comparing the identifying information, so as to monitor an object during a storage period or during transportation, or since the moment when the tag was affixed to the object, and detect the tag from being taken off, exchanged or altered.

As to claim(s) 17,

The claim is drawn to substantially the same subject matter as at least claims 12-14, as addressed above, and is thus rejected under the same reasoning.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shirley Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-8546. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Shirley Lu/
Examiner, Art Unit 2612